



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



AF/TF

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/029,461	12/21/2001	John A. Dispenza	129250-001049/US	5477
------------	------------	------------------	------------------	------

32498 7590 07/14/2008
CAPITOL PATENT & TRADEMARK LAW FIRM, PLLC
P.O. BOX 1995
VIENNA, VA 22183

EXAMINER

LIN, KUANG Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1793

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/14/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/029,461	DISPENZA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kuang Y. Lin	1793	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17 and 18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/29/02</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1793

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-8 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,344,477 to Miki et al. and further in view of US 5,040,589 to Bradley et al.

Miki et al. substantially show (see, col. 1, lines 24-35) the invention as claimed except that they do not show to rheocast Mg alloy to unite the conductive core object. However, it is a common knowledge that Mg alloy possesses high thermal conductivity, it would have been obvious to use Mg alloy as a cast material for forming the fins of the heat exchanger of Miki et al. Further, Bradley et al. show that it is desirable to rheocast Mg alloy, instead of die casting of molten Mg alloy, such that to reduce the energy consumption, increase the die service life, etc. (see col. 1, lines 10-51). It would have been obvious to use the

Art Unit: 1793

semi-solid Mg alloy of Bradley et al. as a casting material in the process of making heat exchanger of Miki et al. in view of the advantage. With respect to claims 3 and 4, it would have been obvious to obtain the optimal composition and process parameters for forming the fins through routine experimentation.

4. Claims 9-16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,344,477 to Miki et al. and further in view of US 5,040,589 to Bradley et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US 3,841,390 to DiBenedetto et al.

DiBenedetto et al. show to continuous cast articles by using a use a continuous casting machine, which consists of two series of die plates, such that to speed up the casting process. It would have been obvious to use the continuous casting machine of DiBenedetto et al. for forming the heat exchanger of Miki et al. in view of the advantage. with respect to claims 11 and 12, it would have been obvious to obtain the optimal composition and process parameters for forming the fins through routine experimentation.

5. Applicant's arguments filed May 29, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. Applicant in page 7, 3rd para. of the response stated that neither Miki nor Bradley disclose the feature of "a substantially continuous void free interface between a core object and a metal slurry" as in claim1. However, When the semi-solid magnesium alloy of Bradley is used in the process of Miki for making the heat exchanger, it is expected to have a substantially void free interface between the core and the metal slurry since the semi-solid slurry of Bradley is

also injected into the mold cavity of Miki to unite the core perform. The modified process is the same process as the instant application. The result of that process will be the same as that of instant application.

b. Applicant in page 8, 1st para. of the response stated that Miki provides insufficient motivation to use a thixotropic metal because the higher viscosity metal would have less flowability in forming intimate contact to create the interface with the object. However, it is a known practice to inject semi-solid slurry into a casting die to unite to a preform object (see, for example, col. 3, lines 18-65, col. 6, lines 28-40 and examples 1-6 of US 5,775,403 to Premkumar et al.) Thus, to use a thixotropic metal in the process of Miki to unite to a preform object is deemed to be obvious to those of ordinary skill in the casting art.

c. Applicant in page 9, 2nd para. of the response stated that Bradley et al. do not suggest to use AZ91D magnesium in their process. However, they do disclose that various modified composition of alloy AZ91 also were used in their process (see col. 12, lines 26-27, col. 13, lines 42-46). Also, it is a known practice to use thixo-molding method for casting AZ91 series of magnesium alloy (see col. 5, 1st para. of US 6,460,602 to Kubota et al.) Thus, to use AZ91D in Bradley et al. is deemed to be obvious to those of ordinary skill in the casting art.

d. Applicant in page 10, 3rd para. of the response stated that vulcanized rubber belts of DiBenedetto are not suitable to be used at the pressure and temperature of Miki and Bradley et al. However, DiBenedetto does disclose that it is conventional to use continuous casting machine having metallic belt-mold

sections for casting metallic article (see col.1, lines 5-16 of DiBenedetto). The metallic belt-mold sections continuous casting machine of DiBenedetto is the same as that of instant application.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuang Y. Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-1179. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:00-6:30,.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jessica L. Ward can be reached on 571-272-1223. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1793

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kuang Lin/
Primary Examiner
AU 1793

7-9-08

Notice of References Cited	Application/Control No. 10/029,461		Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination DISPENZA ET AL.	
	Examiner Kuang Y. Lin		Art Unit 1793	Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
*	A	US-6,460,602	10-2002	Kubota et al.	164/138
*	B	US-5,775,403	07-1998	Premkumar et al.	164/98
	C	US-			
	D	US-			
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.



COPIES OF PAPERS
ORIGINALY FILED

3743

3

Attorney Docket: Dispenza 8-3

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT
AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicants: J. A. DISPENZA,
ET AL.

Application No.: 10/029,461

Filed: December 21, 2001

For: HEAT EXCHANGING APPARATUS
AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

Art Unit: 3743

Examiner:

TO: Box Non-Fee Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify this
correspondence is being
deposited with the United
States Postal Service as
First Class Mail with sufficient
postage in an envelope
addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents,
Washington, D.C. 20231 on the
date noted below.


Attorney: Leo Zucker

Dated: March 20, 2002


RECEIVED
APR 03 2002
TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

S I R :

Attached are applicants' Information Disclosure
Statement Forms PTO/SB/08A & /08B. Copies of all references
cited on the forms are also attached. Applicants respectfully
request that the references be considered and made of record in
the present application.

Respectfully submitted,


Leo Zucker, Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 27,608

50 Main Street, Suite 480
White Plains, New York 10606

Telephone: (914) 761-7799

March 20, 2002



PTO/SB/02A (10-01)
Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0851-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
is required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB

+

RECEIVED
APR 03 2002
TECHNOLOGY CENTER R370

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

***EXAMINER:** Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609. Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

¹ Applicant's unique citation designation number (optional). ² See Kinda Codes of USPTO Patent Documents at www.uspto.gov or MPEP 601.04. ³ Enter Office that issued the document, by the two-letter code (WIPO Standard ST.3). ⁴ For Japanese patent documents, the indication of the year of the reign of the Emperor must precede the serial number of the patent document. ⁵ Kind of document by the appropriate symbols as indicated on the document under WIPO Standard ST. 10 if possible. ⁶ Applicant is to place a check mark here if English language translation is attached.

Duration Hear Statement: This form is estimated to take 2.0 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. **DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.**

MAR 29 2002
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

COPY OF PAPERS
ORIGINALLY FILED

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Substitute for form 1446B/PTO		Complete if Known	
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT (use as many sheets as necessary)		Application Number	10/029,461
		Filing Date	12/21/2001
		First Named Inventor	J. A. Dispender
		Group Art Unit	3743
		Examiner Name	
Sheet 2 of 2	Attorney Docket Number		

RECEIVED
APR 03 2002
TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

OTHER PRIOR ART - NON PATENT LITERATURE DOCUMENTS		
Examiner Initials*	Cite No. ¹	Include name of the author (in CAPITAL LETTERS), title of the article (when appropriate), title of the item (book, magazine, journal, serial, symposium, catalog, etc.), date, page(s), volume-issue number(s), publisher, city and/or country where published
/K.L./		K. Saito et al, Development of an Injection Molding Process for Magnesium Alloys (undated)
/K.L./		N.L. Bradley et al, Thixomoulding, Advanced Machinery for Polymer Processing, pp 174-79 (undated)

Examiner Signature	/Kuang Lin/	Date Considered	07/09/2008
--------------------	-------------	-----------------	------------

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609. Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

¹ Applicant's unique citation designation number (optional). ² Applicant is to place a check mark here if English language Translation is attached.

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 2.0 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.